PLANS TO PRESERVE IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND CONTRACT RECORDS NEED TO BE IMPROVED

Report Documentation Page

Form Approved
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE **30 JUL 2010**	2. REPORT TYPE	3. DATES COVERED **00-00-2010 to 00-00-2010**

4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE **Plans to Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need to Be Improved**		5a. CONTRACT NUMBER
		5b. GRANT NUMBER
		5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER
6. AUTHOR(S)		5d. PROJECT NUMBER
		5e. TASK NUMBER
		5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER

7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) **Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction,400 Army Navy Drive,Arlington,VA,22202**	8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)	10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)
	11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)

12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT
Approved for public release; distribution unlimited

13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES

14. ABSTRACT

15. SUBJECT TERMS

16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT **Same as Report (SAR)**	18. NUMBER OF PAGES **42**	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT **unclassified**	b. ABSTRACT **unclassified**	c. THIS PAGE **unclassified**			

Standard Form 298 (Rev. 8-98)
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z39-18

SIGIR

Special Inspector General for IRAQ Reconstruction

Summary of Report: SIGIR 10-021

Why SIGIR Did this Study

SIGIR's legislative authority states, in part, that it is to perform audits of the programs, operations, and contracts utilizing reconstruction funds to include the maintenance of records on the use of such funds to facilitate future audits and investigations. This report is being issued to address that requirement. Since 2003, the Congress has appropriated $53.31 billion for Iraq relief and reconstruction activities. The Department of Defense (DoD), the Department of State (DoS), and the Administrator of the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID) manage these activities and created records related to their programs. They have the responsibility for preserving the records for Iraq reconstruction activities against loss or premature destruction. DoD's records exceed 100,000 program and contract records. DoS and USAID have an estimated 2,650 program management, grant, and contract records.

The objective for this report is to determine the extent to which principal U.S. agencies responsible for managing Iraq reconstruction activities have plans to preserve reconstruction records.

Recommendations

SIGIR makes recommendations to officials from the DoD, DoS, and USAID to improve their records preservation processes and procedures. Central among those recommendations is that these organizations should coordinate the development of a master list of records to ensure record completeness; link to programs, associated contracts, and funding; and develop uniform retention policies that are consistent with the needs of investigative and audit organizations, and historical preservation.

Lessons Learned

Planning and guidance for the transition and preservation of contingency operations records should be in effect at an operation's start.

Management Comments

We received comments from some DoD organizations and USAID. All generally concurred with the report's recommendations and/or facts. Any additional comments received will be made publicly available.

July 30, 2010

PLANS TO PRESERVE IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION PROGRAM AND CONTRACT RECORDS NEED TO BE IMPROVED

What SIGIR Found

DoD, DoS, and USAID have records management policies and procedures, but have not fully implemented those procedures for preserving their Iraq reconstruction records. This situation leaves the U.S. government vulnerable to waste and theft as it may not have the necessary information to pursue potential cases of fraud and/or to perform audits of reconstruction activities. Additionally, the records have not been reviewed for historical significance, and important documents could be lost if action is not taken.

SIGIR's review showed a range of progress in preserving the records. Some organizations had already shipped many of their records to storage facilities, while others had not. Other organizations were missing records and did not know the status of records that had been shipped to storage. Lastly, some organizations did not have the appropriate-sized storage facilities, adequate plans for preserving records, or the ability to retrieve records in a timely manner. Our review also showed that, in some cases, records for joint reconstruction projects were dispersed among several government organizations and storage of the records had not been coordinated to ensure completeness and availability. This records preservation vulnerability further illustrates SIGIR's long-standing concerns about the ad hoc nature of the management of Iraq reconstruction.

A recent DoD Joint Staff study identified significant problems with all phases of DoD's records management in Iraq, and SIGIR's current work confirmed these problems, but also found progress in resolving the issues. The Joint Staff study was conducted in April 2010. The study noted such problems as an undefined universe of records, lack of adequate guidance and standard operating procedures, and unclear lines of records management responsibility.

SIGIR's current work found that the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, which maintains a large percentage of the DoD records, is well on its way to preserving its records, but other DoD organizations are still focusing on developing plans, assembling and reviewing records for completeness, increasing storage facility capacity, and ensuring record retrieval capabilities. SIGIR is particularly concerned about the lack of progress in preserving Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF) records and Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) records. At this time, little progress has been made in preserving the ISFF program management records, and prior and ongoing SIGIR work has shown that many CERP records are incomplete or cannot be located.

DoS and USAID are organizing their records but have not taken steps to return the records to the United States for storage. The organizations appear to have control over their reconstruction records, but are lacking guidance on how to proceed with preservation planning.

Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction

SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

July 30, 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR U.S. SECRETARY OF STATE
              U.S. AMBASSADOR TO IRAQ
              U.S. SECRETARY OF DEFENSE
              COMMANDER, U.S. CENTRAL COMMAND
              COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. FORCES-IRAQ
              COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S ARMY CENTRAL COMMAND
              COMMANDING GENERAL, U.S. ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
              ADMINISTRATOR, U.S. AGENCY FOR INTERNATIONAL
                    DEVELOPMENT
              MISSION DIRECTOR-IRAQ, U.S. AGENCY FOR
                    INTERNATIONAL DEVELOPMENT

SUBJECT: Plans To Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need To
                 Be Improved (SIGIR 10-021)

We are providing this report for your information and use. The report examines U.S. government agency efforts to preserve Iraq reconstruction program and contract records. We performed this audit in accordance with our statutory responsibilities contained in Public Law 108-106, as amended, which also incorporates the duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978. This law provides for independent and objective audits of programs and operations funded with amounts appropriated or otherwise made available for the reconstruction of Iraq, and for recommendations on related policies designed to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness and to prevent and detect fraud, waste, and abuse. This audit was conducted as SIGIR Project 9030.

We received comments from the U.S. Central Command, Army Central Command, the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers-Gulf Region District, and USAID. All generally concurred with the recommendations and/or facts presented in the report and also provided technical comments that SIGIR addressed as appropriate. The comments are included in Appendix G. Any additional comments received will be made publicly available.

SPECIAL INSPECTOR GENERAL FOR IRAQ RECONSTRUCTION

We appreciate the courtesies extended to the SIGIR staff. For additional information on the report, please contact Glenn Furbish, Principal Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audits (Washington, DC), (703) 604-1388/ glenn.furbish@sigir.mil or Nancee Needham, Deputy Assistant Inspector General for Audits (Baghdad), (240) 553-0581 ext. 3793/ nancee.needham@iraq.centcom.mil.

Stuart W. Bowen, Jr.
Inspector General

cc: Assistant Secretary of the Army (Financial Management and Comptroller)
Chairman, Joint Chiefs of Staff

Table of Contents

Plans To Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need To Be Improved

SIGIR 10-021   **July 30, 2010**

Introduction

The Congress recognized the importance of maintaining U.S. records of the reconstruction of Iraq and included specific requirements related to records management in SIGIR's legislative authority. The statute states, in part, that SIGIR is to perform audits of the programs, operations, and contracts utilizing these reconstruction funds to include the maintenance of records on the use of such funds to facilitate future audits and investigations of the use of such funds.[1] SIGIR has responded to this requirement by identifying, in numerous audits, serious deficiencies in the thoroughness of records on actions taken to implement contracts, programs, projects, and grants.[2] These reports, however, did not examine the final phase of records management—preservation. In this final phase, records are preserved to protect against loss or destruction prior to their final disposition. This report focuses on the planning for the preservation of the Iraq reconstruction records. For the purposes of this report, "preserve" means to protect against loss or destruction prior to required final disposition.

Since 2003, the Congress has appropriated $53.31 billion for Iraq relief and reconstruction activities. U.S. agencies managing these activities created records related to their programs. The programs encompassed activities such as promoting democracy; water treatment, and medical facilities; awarding contracts to complete reconstruction tasks; and entering into grants and cooperative agreements with organizations to carry out activities. The agencies managing reconstruction activities have responsibility for preserving the reconstruction records until they are destroyed. The substantial volume of records that has been produced presents those agencies with a significant and unique management challenge.

Government lawyers, auditors, and other professionals will rely on the reconstruction records when questions are raised about the appropriateness of such things as payments made to contractors for goods and services. The Federal Records Act (44 USC Chapter 31) requires that the head of each federal agency make and preserve records containing adequate and proper documentation of the organization, functions, policies, decisions, procedures, and essential transactions of the agency. The records should be designed to furnish the information necessary to protect the legal and financial rights of the government and of persons directly affected by the agency's activities. Additionally, the Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR) Subpart 4.8 details requirements for establishing, maintaining, and disposing of contract records. The FAR states that agency procedures for contract file disposal must include provisions that the documents may not be destroyed before the times indicated. The FAR also states that contract records may be

---

[1] P.L. 108-106, Sec. 3001, (f).
[2] See Appendix D for a list of those reports.

retained longer if the responsible agency official determines that the records have future value to the government.

These records have historical significance beyond audit and investigative needs. These records provide a chronological history of the reconstruction program that may be of importance to historians and to policymakers who look to identify lessons learned and best practices to inform future contingency efforts undertaken by the U.S. government.

Background

Iraq reconstruction activities and the related records were principally managed by the Department of Defense (DoD), U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID), and Department of State (DoS). The major appropriations associated with the reconstruction activities and the types of records managed by these agencies are discussed below. Because of their roles and responsibilities, DoD organizations managed, by far, the largest number of records. Table 1 shows, in general, the organizations, types of records managed, and the associated reconstruction funds. In most cases, the organizations that had initial responsibility for the records have been succeeded by other organizations. The organizations shown have current responsibility for records management.

Table 1—Records Management Summary for U.S. Funded Iraq Reconstruction

Department/Organization	Reconstruction Records		U.S Funds For Iraq Reconstruction			
	Program Management	Contract Management	IRRF	ISFF	CERP	ESF
Department of Defense:	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
United States Forces-Iraq Engineering Program Management Branch (J7)	✓	✓	✓	✓		
United States Forces-Iraq Resource Management Branch (J8)	✓		✓	✓	✓	
United States Army Corps of Engineers	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment		✓	✓	✓		
U.S. Central Command, Contracting Command		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
Department of State:	✓	✓	✓	✓		✓
U.S. Embassy, Iraq Strategic Partnership Office	✓		✓			✓
United States Agency for International Development Iraq Mission	✓	✓	✓			✓

Source: SIGIR analysis of Iraq Reconstruction Management System data as of February 2010 and audit interviews.

Reconstruction Funds

Four major U.S. funds were used in the reconstruction of Iraq, and multiple agencies received the funds. The following identifies the four funds and the agencies that used them:

- The Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund (IRRF) appropriations totaled about $20.86 billion. DoD received approximately $14.04, DoS received approximately $1.61 billion, and USAID received approximately $4.62 billion.[3] The IRRF was used for activities such as building, repairing, and renovating Iraq's infrastructure such as schools, office buildings, wastewater treatment plants, and oil terminal facilities, and developing the capacity of the Iraqi government.

- The Iraq Security Forces Fund (ISFF) appropriations totaled $18.04 billion and were used to support Iraq's Ministry of Defense and Ministry of Interior in developing the Iraqi Security Forces. Almost $2.5 billion in ISFF was transferred to DoS to fund contracts to support the Iraqi police training program. U.S. Forces-Iraq (USF-I), formerly Multi-National Force-Iraq, provides program management for the ISFF. The funds are used for training, and equipping the Iraqi Security Forces, such as the Iraqi Police, Army, Navy, Air Force, and Special Operations Forces.[4] This included construction of training centers, military bases, and police stations.

- The Commander's Emergency Response Program (CERP) has received $3.74 billion in appropriations from DoD's Operations and Maintenance account. The funds are used by U.S. military commanders to provide targeted local relief and reconstruction projects, such as water and sanitation, electricity, transportation, civic cleanup, agriculture, and economic development activities. Only DoD received these funds.

- The Economic Support Fund (ESF) has provided $4.56 billion for Iraq reconstruction activities. The funds are primarily managed by DoS and USAID, although some funds were transferred by interagency agreements with DoD. The funds are used for programs and grants to improve infrastructure and community security, promote democracy and civil society, and support capacity building and economic development.

Reconstruction Organizations

DoD Reconstruction Agencies

A number of subordinate DoD organizations have records management responsibilities. Overall, DoD organizational records exceed 100,000 program, project, and contract records.

- **CENTCOM Contracting Command** commenced operations on June 11, 2010, and succeeded the Joint Contracting Command-Iraq/Afghanistan (JCC-I/A), which was established in 2005 by DoD as a special command to administer and consolidate DoD's Iraq and Afghanistan contracting activities. CENTCOM Contracting Command is responsible for managing contracting records for programs and projects using IRRF, CERP, and ISFF appropriations, and also some ESF funds transferred through interagency

---

[3] Other U.S. government organizations, such as U.S. Department of the Treasury and the U.S. Trade and Development Agency, also received IRRF appropriations.

[4] SIGIR will discuss the management of records for programs to train and equip the Iraqi Security Forces in forthcoming reports.

agreements. The Command has the most significant reconstruction records management responsibilities for Iraq reconstruction activities.

- **U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE)** had several sub-organizations that were responsible for maintaining reconstruction records. These include the Transatlantic Division (formerly Gulf Region Division) and Gulf Region District (formerly Gulf Region Central, and Gulf Region South and Gulf Region North). By April 2010, USACE had reorganized and downsized its footprint in Iraq. Gulf Region District is the sole remaining district in Iraq.[5] USACE provides reconstruction engineering services to DoD, DoS, and USAID. USACE is involved in the planning, design, and management of military and civil-infrastructure construction projects funded, to some degree, by the IRRF, CERP, ISFF, and ESF funds transferred through interagency agreements. Consequently, USACE reconstruction records include project and contract files.

- **Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment (AFCEE)**[6] administers programs and projects for DoD components. The projects and contracts were funded by IRRF and ISFF appropriations. Primarily, these programs were for facilities, schools, housing, police stations, and training centers. AFCEE reconstruction records include program and project files.

- **USF-I Engineering Program Management Branch (J7)** maintains program and project records as the ISFF construction program manager. Contracts to implement these programs are managed by AFCEE, USACE, and/or the CENTCOM Contracting Command. As discussed above, those organizations manage their respective records.

- **USF-I Resource Management Branch (J8)** coordinates CERP-funded activities and manages CERP-funded contracts under $500,000. It develops annual CERP funding requirements, allocates funds, and monitors commitments, obligations, and disbursements. J8 receives all completed CERP project files and forwards them to U.S. Army Central Command (ARCENT) at the end of the following fiscal year. A separate office, J8 FWD plans, programs, budgets, and executes ISFF resources in support of USF-I's train and equip mission.

DoS Reconstruction Organizations

DoS and USAID reconstruction programs were funded by ESF and IRRF appropriations. DoS also managed the ISFF-funded contract for State Department support to the Iraqi police training program. The Iraq Transition Assistance Office (ITAO), now the Iraq Strategic Partnership Office (ISPO), of the U.S. Embassy Baghdad directly managed some ESF projects. Others were managed by State Department bureaus in Washington, D.C. The USAID Mission in Iraq principally managed and contracted for its own programs, such as infrastructure restoration, economic development, and health care, but set up interagency agreements for some contract oversight services from DoD. ISPO and USAID have an estimated 2,650 program management, grant, and contract records.

---

[5] All USACE organizations involved in Iraq reconstruction will be collectively referred to as USACE for the purposes of this report.
[6] AFCEE provides the U.S. Air Force technical and professional services in environmental and installation planning, construction, engineering, and military housing construction and privatization.

According to a DoS official, the former U.S. Embassy offices ITAO and the Iraq Reconstruction Management Office provided coordination and oversight of large programs such as the Provincial Reconstruction Development Council, Infrastructure Security Protection, and the Ministerial Transitional Capacity Development Program intended to improve the capabilities of the Government of Iraq. The offices also coordinated with DoD components that were managing and contracting for infrastructure projects funded by IRRF and ESF.

Multiple Agencies Were Frequently Involved

Program and contract management responsibilities for reconstruction activities were frequently dispersed among DoD and DoS organizations. For example, on the contract to design and construct a wastewater treatment plant for Fallujah, the ITAO coordinated the overall U.S. water sector program, USACE managed the project, and JCC-I/A managed the contract award. Each of these agencies was responsible for managing and preserving its records related to the project.

Objectives

The objective for this report is to determine the extent to which principal U.S. agencies responsible for managing Iraq reconstruction activities have plans to preserve their reconstruction records. For purposes of this report, we use the term plans in a general nature to include policies and procedures used to implement coordination and preservation of Iraq reconstruction records.

We reviewed the results of the Joint Staff (JS) Records Management Program Assessment of records management by DoD combatant commanders reported in November 2008 and a subsequent follow-on assessment of USF-I reported in April 2010. To avoid duplication of effort, we presented the work of the JS team in those cases where we verified that it was consistent with the results of our ongoing work and comments from the agencies under review. We also note any differences in results between the team's study and our work. Further, we note that the scope of the JS work in April 2010 included all contingency records, while our work focused on only those records related to reconstruction activities. However, the systemic concerns that the team raised apply to the reconstruction records. Also, the JS study did not cover JCC-I/A before it was reorganized into the CENTCOM Contracting Command.

For a discussion of the audit scope and methodology and a summary of prior coverage, see Appendix A. For the FAR Contract File Retention Schedule, see Appendix B. For Records Management Guidance, see Appendix C. For Records Management Deficiencies Identified in Prior Reports, see Appendix D. For a list of acronyms used, see Appendix E. For the audit team members, see Appendix F. For management comments, see Appendix G. For the SIGIR mission and contact information, see Appendix H.

Significant Gaps Exist in DoD's Records Preservation Efforts, but Some Progress Has Been Made

Significant gaps exist in DoD's efforts for preserving its Iraq reconstruction records. Consistent with our audit work, an April 2010 JS study found significant problems with all phases of DoD's records management in Iraq. The study noted such problems as an undefined universe of records, lack of adequate guidance and standard operating procedures, and unclear lines of records management responsibility.

SIGIR identified the same concerns as the JS study. While having overall records management policies and procedures, SIGIR found gaps in the implementation of DoD policies and procedures. USACE has done well in preserving its records, but other DoD organizations are still focusing on assembling and reviewing records for completeness, increasing storage facility capacity, and ensuring record retrieval capabilities. SIGIR is particularly concerned about the records for projects funded by the ISFF and CERP funds.

JS Study Finds Significant Records Management Gaps

In 2008, the JS conducted a worldwide review of U.S. Combatant Commands' records management programs and found that CENTCOM's program had weaknesses but noted that the Command had plans or actions underway to address its problems. CENTCOM has operational control for U.S. forces stationed in Iraq. The study noted that it was critical for CENTCOM to meet the requirements for managing records to protect the interests of the Command and the U.S. government, to document lessons learned, and to comply with federal statute and DoD policy.

In April 2010, a JS team reviewed the status of DoD's operational and reconstruction records in Iraq for a second time. The purpose of that review was to "ensure the preservation of records created/maintained during armed conflict." Overall, the JS team found improvement since its initial review, but nonetheless, identified major deficiencies in all phases of records management including the following:

- The volume, location, size, and format of USF-I records was unknown.

- Guidance on records requirements was not fully disseminated or implemented.

- Directorates and staff offices lack standard operating procedures for basic records management requirements, including retention and migration.

- Lines of demarcation between CENTCOM and military service records and records management responsibilities were unclear.

- Large gaps existed in records collections, resulting in the failure to capture significant operational and historical activities.

The JS team found that CENTCOM had not provided and enforced adequate records management guidance to USF-I and its predecessor, the Multi-National Force-Iraq. Moreover, CENTCOM established a policy in October 2009 whereby records management was delegated to the individual military services rather than to CENTCOM and its USF-I components in Iraq. Based on this delegation of authority, for example, AFCEE follows Air Force records management policies while USACE and JCC-I/A followed Army records management policies. The team found that this approach was not working to meet DoD records management requirements. In commenting on a draft of this report, CENTCOM stated that it established a policy for managing records in February 2008 which was subsequently revised in October 2009. This revised policy directed that its components, such as ARCENT, use the records management policies established by their respective services to manage reconstruction records.

The JS study's findings are consistent with SIGIR's findings and prior SIGIR reports detailing weaknesses in records management on specific reconstruction programs and contracts. For example, SIGIR has reported numerous instances where CERP project files were incomplete, IRRF contract files lacked required financial transaction documents, and CERP and IRRF files could not be located. In a recent example, SIGIR's April 2010 report on CERP projects conducted at the Baghdad International Airport found that DoD experienced problems in managing files to the point that accountability for the project outcomes was not clear. These deficiencies were significant enough to constitute a major weakness in ensuring that CERP funds are not subject to fraud and waste.[7] Reports that discuss these and other records management issues are included in Appendix D.

On April 9, 2010, the JS team made a series of recommendations to address records management deficiencies. Of particular importance was the recommendation that USF-I lead all DoD records management activities for Iraq, and that CENTCOM provide guidance to that effect. Additionally, the JS team recommended that CENTCOM take a number of actions in Iraq and for other similar contingency operations, including the following tasks:

- Identify clear lines of authority for in-theater war records.

- Work with USF-I to establish policies and procedures for information capture, sharing, and retention.

- Send qualified personnel to Iraq to assist with records management drawdown activities and provide training for record managers before they deploy.

A USF-I official stated that CENTCOM and USF-I took steps to implement the recommendations. In May 2010, CENTCOM provided initial guidance and conducted an assistance visit to the USF-I Records Management office. In commenting on a draft of this report, however, CENTCOM stated that USF-I issued final guidance for records management on July 18, 2010.

According to the USF-I official, CENTCOM began to subordinate organizations records to determine the amount of electronic and paper information held, and the size in cubic feet of

---

[7] *Commander's Emergency Response Program: Projects at Baghdad Airport Provided Some Benefits, but Waste and Management Problems Occurred*, SIGIR 10-013, 4/26/2010.

paper records. Nevertheless, other recommendations, such as identifying clear lines of authority for in-theater records have yet to be addressed. According to a JS official, as of April 2010, USF-I did not have personnel in country to adequately address the file management and storage issue. He further stated that neither CENTCOM nor USF-I had an adequate plan for managing the volume and location of the information it was maintaining as U.S. forces leave Iraq.

SIGIR Notes Progress and Problems in Preserving Reconstruction Records

SIGIR's review found that the various DoD organizations in Iraq are proceeding with steps to assemble and permanently store their reconstruction records, but progress among the organizations varies significantly. USACE, one of the largest records holders, has made good progress, and has a detailed, written records management and archiving plan to guide records preservation efforts. However, the other DoD organizations had made less progress. For example, we noted that some organizations were missing records or did not know the status of records shipped to storage. Others lacked appropriate-sized facilities to store records or had not developed processes for organizing and retrieving those records in a timely manner.

USACE Has Transfer Plan but Lacks Data on Records Shipped to Storage

At the time of our review, USACE had detailed plans for preserving its program, project, and contract records and had a process to transfer these records to a permanent storage facility. USACE has identified records for 8,470 projects valued at $16.15 billion in various reconstruction funds that it plans to store in Winchester, Virginia. According to the JS study of USACE records, the records are well-kept and in good order.

USACE's records management plan follows Army Regulation 25-1, *Army Knowledge Information Management and Information Technology*, dated December 4, 2008. The plan assigns responsibilities, identifies the records that should be preserved (such as signed contracts or task orders, statements of work, statements of requirements and quality assurance reports), and defines the process and procedures for archiving. The plan also states that well-marked and well-packaged hard copy and/or electronic documents from all offices (division, district, area, and resident offices) are required to be sent to the USACE records holding area in Winchester, Virginia. Overall responsibility for records management resides with USACE.

One shortcoming in USACE's process, however, is that it lacks comprehensive information on its progress in shipping completed records. Each regional office in Iraq handled the preparation and shipping of its project and contract records independently. According to a USACE official, there was no single collection point in Iraq for records from district offices around Iraq. The district offices did not send their official records transmittal and receipt forms capturing the status of their contract records to USACE when the districts were disbanded.

However, USACE officials stated that it is in the process of gathering the forms generated from each former USACE district. Also, in commenting on a draft of this report, USACE stated that it established a records management section in November 2009 to ensure better oversight of the archiving of records. Using this information, USACE will identify the numbers of project and

contract records sent to Virginia. The division estimates that this task will be completed by October 2010.

CENTCOM Contracting Command Made Progress in Permanently Archiving Contract Records but Needs Better Tracking of Records

The CENTCOM Contracting Command, which succeeded JCC-I/A, has undertaken a number of efforts to plan for the preservation of its reconstruction contract records. Many JCC-I/A records were shipped to a storage location in San Antonio, Texas, where they have been scanned into databases. However, a former JCC-I/A official noted that more needs to be done before the records are ready for final storage. In some cases, records are incomplete and prior audits have shown that other records could not be located. It is now the responsibility of CENTCOM Contracting Command to address these issues.

The Command established a Contract Closeout Task Force Office in November 2008, before JCC-I/A was disbanded. According to the Task Force Director, the JCC-I/A Commander directed that all contract records with a completion or award date in or prior to fiscal year 2009 be shipped to the permanent storage facility by September 2009. Also, according to JCC-I/A contracting officials, JCC-I/A conducted an inventory of contracting records in Iraq and Afghanistan in 2009. That inventory identified 90,000 contracting records through fiscal year 2008, which would fall under this requirement. JCC-I/A officials further informed us that of these records, 85,000 contracts were shipped to storage. The remaining 5,000 records were shipped to the Defense Contract Management Agency in southern Europe for contract closeout.

As with USACE, JCC-I/A also lacks documentation to support the records it has shipped. A JCC-I/A official said that it shipped 90,000 contract records, but could not locate shipment record transmittal and receipts, and the person responsible was no longer in Iraq. According to the Task Force Director, they have developed a database to register the contract records received from the JCC-I/A regional contracting offices in Iraq and Afghanistan. However, as of January 2010, the database was not fully operational.

An additional problem impacting the storage and ease of document retrieval is the small size of the storage facility in San Antonio. In November 2009, the then-JCC-I/A Director of Operations informed us that the facility had the capacity to store only 25,000 records. This is about 25% of JCC-I/A's record storage needs. In January 2010, JCC-I/A officials told us that the Task Force hired additional personnel to process the records and rented additional space to house those personnel. However, the issue of the space needed for the documents has not been resolved.

J7 Engineering Program Management Branch Beginning Work on Assembling ISFF Program and Project Records

According to J7 Engineering Program Management Branch officials, the branch does not have procedures for shipping records to a final storage facility and is not familiar with the regulations for storage and disposition of project files. The officials noted that over the past five years of building facilities for the Iraqi Security Forces, project files were maintained by individuals with varying degrees of program management experience. As a result, the quality and completeness of the records they currently have vary from project to project.

The ISFF construction project records should include requirements statements, operational and training manuals, and asset transfer documents. In January 2010, officials from J7 informed us they were taking steps to preserve their ISFF files by purging, renaming, and organizing the files. In March 2010, the officials stated they had identified 2,134 projects closed as of January 31, 2010, and planned to continue to work on assembling the files through the end of September 2011. A J7 branch official noted it had not received any guidance from CENTCOM or ARCENT regarding where and to what office the records should be shipped. In commenting on a draft of this report however, CENTCOM stated its policies for records management were in effect at the time the J7 official made these statements.

J8 Resource Management Branch's CERP Project Records in Disarray

The J8 Resource Management Branch is responsible for managing the records for the $3.74 billion CERP program. J8 officials told us that there are specific file content requirements for CERP projects, and that it has ensured that the project records have been maintained. They also said that they have been routinely sending records to ARCENT, which stores them in a facility at Fort Gillem, Georgia.

Nevertheless, in this and other SIGIR audits, we have found serious problems in the completeness of CERP files and in the ability to locate CERP project records. For example, our review of J8 tracking information and work on other reviews and inspections found that DoD does not have accurate information on its CERP records. During this audit, SIGIR attempted, but could not verify, the number of files shipped to ARCENT for fiscal years 2007 through 2009. We obtained a listing that J8 maintained of all the file numbers of records that were shipped and compared them to the CERP Project Tracking spreadsheet. The spreadsheet provides the project number and the status of the project.

We found, however, that the file numbers used by the Multi-National Divisions to identify their records did not always match the numbers listed on the Project Tracking spreadsheet. During the course of the review, J8 officials stated that they would take steps to rectify this problem. In March 2010, a J8 official stated that the branch began creating an improved tracking system. The system is supposed to identify records shipped in the Project Tracking spreadsheet. Officials also stated they were in the process of formalizing the steps that needed to be taken to develop and preserve their records. Lastly, they noted they are formalizing the records management process which will include records training.

SIGIR has experienced problems in retrieving records once they have been sent to the ARCENT storage facility. According to J8 officials, once the records are received at Fort McPherson, Georgia, they are shipped to a final storage facility co-located at Fort Gillem, Georgia. An ARCENT representative told us that the records often do not contain an inventory that would allow them to be catalogued and stored in a manner that permits easy identification and retrieval. ARCENT personnel also told us that the records are placed in cages and separated by fiscal year, location, and funding source. However, finding an individual record remains difficult since the boxes have been shipped from Iraq unlabeled and without an inventory of contents.

To illustrate, in an ongoing review of a CERP-funded program, in May 2010 SIGIR requested 116 CERP records from fiscal years 2007 through 2010. The J8 Project Tracking spreadsheet indicated that 66 had been sent to ARCENT. As of July 27, 2010, ARCENT was able to locate

31 of the records. However, an ARCENT official stated that it had taken approximately 150 man-hours to locate the records. In a July 2010 visit to ARCENT, we confirmed the difficult problem facing ARCENT in inventorying and archiving these records. For example, we saw large pallets of unorganized records that had arrived from Iraq that ARCENT will have to catalogue for storage. ARCENT officials are fully aware of the problem and are taking steps to address the issues. These include issuing an instruction requiring better organization and cataloging of records shipped from Iraq and hiring additional personnel. In commenting on a draft of this report, ARCENT stated that it expects to issue final instructions for record storage and retrieval by September 1, 2010. If properly implemented, these steps should improve the record retrieval process. Figures 1-2 show ARCENT's records storage facility.

Figure 1: Pallet Boxes Containing Smaller Boxes of Files Sent From the Field Including Iraq and Afghanistan CERP Files.

Source: SIGIR photograph taken during site visit July 27, 2010

Figure 2: Contents of a Pallet Boxes Which Contain Boxes of FY08 CERP Files Sent Directly From the Field.

Source: SIGIR photograph taken during site visit July 27, 2010.

AFCEE Records Are Not Ready for Final Storage

AFCEE officials stated that none of its contract records are eligible to be sent to final storage. However, the officials stated that they are following the records requirements prescribed in Air Force Manual 33-363, *Communication and Information, Records Disposition–Procedures and Responsibilities*, dated March 1, 2008.

AFCEE officials stated that contract files are eligible for final storage when the contract has been formally closed out for a least one year. According to AFCEE documents, as of March 2010, of the 291 contracts, 52 had been closed out. As such, AFCEE is maintaining all of the hard copies of contract records in its contracting office at Brooks Air Force Base, Texas. AFCEE staff in Iraq use electronic versions for their day-to-day management. AFCEE officials informed us that the contract records will be maintained and available for review as necessary at Brooks Air Force Base.

DoS and USAID Need To Improve Preservation Planning

Although the U.S. Embassy-Baghdad organization responsible for overseeing reconstruction programs and the USAID Mission in Iraq have established policies and procedures for records management, they have not started implementing the procedures to archive the records to the United States. While these records represent a smaller volume of information than DoD records, they remain an important part of the reconstruction records. The Embassy's Iraq Strategic Partnership Office (ISPO) has taken some steps to ready its files for transfer. The USAID Mission has made some progress, but its records remain in Iraq.

U.S. Embassy Records Have Not Been Preserved

In September 2009, the former Iraq Transition Assistance Office (ITAO) created a new policy regarding archiving and preserving its records. It began taking steps to inventory existing records and determine what records to archive and which records to destroy. Former ITAO officials informed us that in October 2009 they contacted the DoS Records Officer seeking guidance on preserving the ITAO records. DoS assigned a records manager to work with ITAO to help it determine what information should be preserved. The manager provided guidance on how and where to transfer records.

ISPO officials informed SIGIR that they were taking actions to prepare their records for transfer to storage. However, ISPO plans to continue to maintain all records in Iraq until it is no longer operational. ISPO maintains records of 35 projects for the nearly $40.5 million Ministerial and Management Capacity Development Program. The office also has 25 other reconstruction project and grant records. The records for any contract associated with these projects and grants are the responsibility of the CENTCOM Contracting Command. ISPO records management policies and procedures are governed by the DoS Foreign Affairs Manual and Handbook. That document contains policies and procedures for the creation, maintenance, use, and disposition of DoS records. The DoS records manager is located in Washington, D.C. and provides shipping and handling procedures for sending files to the Records Center in Newington, Virginia. ISPO officials also informed us that they are confident that their records will be complete and ready for final storage when this information is no longer needed in Iraq.

USAID Records Remain in Iraq

USAID Mission officials informed SIGIR that in January 2009 they began to implement agency-wide records management and preservation requirements. The Mission stated that on February 28, 2010, it had records for 107 contracts, grants, and cooperative agreements associated with its $7.1 billion in reconstruction program activities, but all of its records remain in Iraq.

The USAID Administrative Directive Systems Chapter 502, Records Management Program, dated September 2, 2008, contains the policies and procedures for creating, maintaining, storing, and disposing of USAID records. It requires that USAID's Missions annually provide the Information and Records Division an inventory of all their records. USAID's Missions are to

14

also provide a plan that addresses storage, transfer, and destruction of records. In response, in March 2010, the USAID Mission in Iraq completed a Records Inventory and Disposition plan that listed the 45 active and 26 closed awards and their location. Moreover, USAID established a guide that outlines the procedures for maintaining and updating electronic documents in the contracting office. The guidelines prescribe a filing format for contracts and task orders. It also tasks the contracting officer with verifying that appropriate documents are filed in accordance with the electronic filing procedures.

However, the Mission has not met directive requirements that state that missions in "troubled areas where threat of emergency exists" can keep records covering no more than one fiscal year. Files older than one year must be shipped to the USAID Records Depository in Washington, D.C., to then be archived in the Washington National Records Center in Suitland, Maryland. Recognizing that the records cannot be permanently stored until all the financial and other administrative requirements have been completed, USAID agreed that 16 completed contract, grant, and program records totaling $257 million had gone through this process. Nevertheless, to date, USAID has not identified a permanent record storage area in the United States, and no records have been shipped. Moreover, as of June 2010, USAID Iraq could not tell SIGIR when it plans to begin shipping eligible records back to the United States. In addition, USAID had only partially updated its plan and was unable to explain why it needed to retain the files in Iraq. According to USAID officials, they plan to request that USAID Headquarters provide them guidance on what to do with their records.

In commenting on a draft of this report, USAID stated that it had implemented an Agency-wide Vital Records Program for those records that are essential to the continuity of USAID activities under national emergency conditions. This includes scanning contract files and other records and storing these documents offline and offsite to facilitate easier access and recovery. In addition, based on the audit recommendation, files covering no more than one fiscal year will be packed in official retirement boxes and shipped to the depository in Washington, D.C., for retention. The depository serves as a staging area before USAID ships it records to the Washington National Records Center.

Conclusions, Recommendations, and Lessons Learned

Conclusions

DoD, DoS, and USAID, while having overall records management policies and procedures, nevertheless have gaps in implementing those policies and procedures. Some organizations have already shipped a substantial number of records to storage facilities, while others have not. Others were missing records and did not know the status of records that had been shipped to storage. Further, some organizations did not have the appropriate-sized storage facilities, adequate plans for preserving recordings, or the ability to retrieve those records in a timely manner. Lastly, in some cases, records management for joint reconstruction projects were dispersed among several DoD, DoS, and USAID organizations and not coordinated to ensure completeness and availability of project files. These conditions leave the U.S. government vulnerable to not having the necessary information to pursue potential cases of fraud and/or to perform audits of contracts, and losing records with historical value. It also illustrates SIGIR's longstanding concerns about the ad hoc nature of the Iraq reconstruction management process that has led to a lack of accountability across the spectrum of reconstruction management issues.

DoD is responsible for the vast majority of Iraq reconstruction records. As such, it faces a significant management challenge. To this point, efforts have been mixed, and much remains to be completed. USACE's efforts, and the JS study's recommendations to enhance records management in Iraq, are steps in the right direction. Nevertheless, significant gaps exist in implementing the preservation process. This is particularly the case for CERP and ISFF records and, to a lesser extent, for CENTCOM Contracting Command's records. The management challenge and associated risks are complicated because the preservation responsibilities are dispersed among at least five different DoD components, with differing regulations for accomplishing the task. Lacking central guidance, each component has moved forward to accomplish the task, achieving varying degrees of success. Nonetheless, actions must be taken within the existing framework to ensure these records are preserved.

DoS and USAID have a much smaller volume of records to preserve than DoD. DoS has taken actions to organize its records but does not have a specific records preservation plan. USAID has a records preservation plan, but its records remain in Iraq. Further, both organizations appear to have control over their reconstruction records but are lacking guidance on how to proceed with preservation planning.

Recommendations

1. SIGIR recommends that the U.S. Secretaries of Defense and State and the Administrator of USAID assign an office the responsibility for ensuring the preservation of the Iraq reconstruction records to provide transparency and accountability at the Department level. At a minimum, these offices should coordinate the development of a master list of records to (1) ensure record completeness; (2) link to program, associated contracts, and funding; and (3) develop uniform retention policies that are consistent with the needs of investigative and audit organizations. The office should also consult with agency historians to determine which records may require permanent archiving.

2. SIGIR recommends that the Commander, U.S. Central Command, in implementing the JS recommendations, include in the new guidance specific direction related to the transfer and preservation of reconstruction records that incorporates methods for tracking records, identification of program and associated funding, and final storage location.

3. SIGIR recommends that the Commander, U.S. Central Command, direct the CENTCOM Contracting Command to review the efforts by the former JCC-I/A to identify remaining issues that need to be addressed in the preservation planning process, such as completeness of contracting records, missing records, tracking records, and the adequacy of storage facilities.

4. SIGIR recommends the Commanding General, USF-I, direct that plans be developed for preserving the ISFF and CERP records. These plans could take the form of standard operating procedures to help ensure that existing records are complete and missing records have been identified.

5. SIGIR recommends that the Commanding General, ARCENT, review the processes being used to store and locate CERP records.

6. SIGIR also recommends that the Secretary of State provide U.S. Embassy Baghdad with detailed guidance to be used for the final storage of reconstruction records; and U.S. Embassy Baghdad develop plans for the preservation of reconstruction records in accordance with this guidance.

7. SIGIR recommends that the Administrator, USAID, provide guidance to its Iraq Mission on the preservation of reconstruction records; and the Mission Director, USAID Iraq, develop plans for the preservation of reconstruction records in accordance with this guidance.

Lessons Learned

Planning and guidance for the transition and preservation of records created during a contingency operation should be in effect at the beginning of the contingency operation, not left to chance at the end. Overall policies with clear lines of authority need to be developed and disseminated by JS for all combatant commands. In contingency reconstruction actions, it is critical that all agencies plan for the end of the operation by establishing comprehensive record keeping procedures from the start. This lesson learned should be implemented immediately for all other ongoing contingency operations, such as Afghanistan.

Management Comments and Audit Response

CENTCOM, ARCENT, the USACE-Gulf Region District, and USAID provided comments on a draft of this report. CENTCOM and ARCENT concurred with the report's recommendations and/or facts presented in the report and provided technical comments that SIGIR addressed as appropriate. USAID statements generally concurred with report's recommendations and/or did not otherwise raise objections. We will follow-up with USAID to determine the specific actions it plans to take on our recommendations. Further, USAID also provided technical comments that SIGIR addressed as appropriate. USACE also provided technical comments that SIGIR addressed as appropriate.

Any additional comments received will be made publicly available.

Appendix A—Scope and Methodology

Scope and Methodology

In September 2009, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction (SIGIR) initiated Project 9030 to examine agency plans for transitioning Iraq reconstruction program, project, and contract records to permanent storage facilities. The objective for this report is to determine the extent to which principal U.S. agencies responsible for managing Iraq reconstruction activities have plans to preserve reconstruction records. For purposes of this report, we use the term "plans" in a general nature to include policies and procedures used to implement records management requirements. SIGIR performed the audit under the authority of Public Law 108-106, as amended, which also incorporates the duties and responsibilities of inspectors general under the Inspector General Act of 1978. SIGIR conducted its work during November 2009 through July 2010 in Baghdad, Iraq and the United States .

To accomplish our objective we held discussions with officials and reviewed records management processes and procedures from the United States Army Corp of Engineers (USACE); Air Force Center for Engineering and Environment (AFCEE); Joint Contracting Command-Iraq/Afghanistan (JCC-I/A); United States Forces-Iraq (USF-I) Engineering, Program, Management Branch (J7); USF-I Resource Management Branch (J8); Department of State's Iraq Transition Assistance Office (ITAO) and Iraq Strategic Partnership Office (ISPO); and the U.S. Agency for International Development (USAID). We also visited the U.S. Army Central Command and reviewed their process for storing and retrieving records.

Additionally, we reviewed the results of the Joint Staff Records Management Program Assessment of records management by combatant commanders. A follow-on assessment was conducted for USF-I during the course of our audit in April 2010. The Joint Staff assessment reviewed the records management programs for all of the USF-I directorates, except JCC-I/A, whereas SIGIR only reviewed the records management programs of two USF-I directorates involved in reconstruction program management activities. To avoid duplication of effort we presented the work of the Joint Staff team once we verified it was consistent with the results of our ongoing work.

We reviewed the Department of Defense and Department of State agencies policies and procedures that implement the Federal Records Act tenets and the National Archives and Records Association code of federal regulations for preservation and disposition of records. In addition, see Appendix C for a list of all regulations, polices, and guidance reviewed. We provided officials questions and reviewed the rules and regulations identified above to ascertain the scope of the records to be retained and whether the organization was in compliance with the rules and regulations for preserving program, project, and contract records. Our effort was extended to JCC-I/A, USACE, USF-I, AFCEE, U.S. Central Command (CENTCOM), ITAO, ISPO and USAID in order to include those agencies or organizations that generated program, project, and contract records in support of Operation Iraqi Freedom. We reviewed the procedures for transferring records which are not in compliance with federal rules and regulations.

The audit was conducted in accordance with generally accepted government auditing standards. Those standards require that we plan and perform the audit to obtain sufficient, appropriate evidence to provide a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives. We believe that the evidence obtained provides a reasonable basis for our findings and conclusions based on our audit objectives.

Use of Computer-processed Data

We obtained computer-processed data contained in the MAXIMO database maintained by USACE and the Crystal Viewer systems database maintained by USAID for background and information purposes. The data was insignificant to the audit results and was not verified but considered sufficiently reliable for purposes of the audit objective.

Internal Controls

In conducting the audit, we assessed certain internal controls pertinent to the audit objective with respect to agencies' preservation of program, project, and contract records. Specifically, we identified and assessed internal or management controls, including processes for:

- creation, maintenance, and disposition of Iraq reconstruction records

- recordkeeping activities for preserving program, project, and contracting efforts in Iraq

Prior Coverage

The SIGIR reports that were reviewed for this report are listed in Appendix D.

Appendix B—FAR Subpart 4.8 Retention Schedule

Document	Retention Period
(1) Records pertaining to Contract Disputes Act actions.	6 years and 3 months after final action or decision for records created prior to October 1, 1979. 1 year after final action or decision for records created on or after October 1, 1979.
(2) Contracts (and related records or documents, including successful proposals) exceeding the simplified acquisition threshold for other than construction.	6 years and 3 months after final payment.
(3) Contracts (and related records or documents, including successful proposals) at or below the simplified acquisition threshold for other than construction.	3 years after final payment.
(4) Construction contracts:	
(i) Above $2,000.	6 years and 3 months after final payment.
(ii) $2,000 or less.	3 years after final payment.
(iii) Related records or documents, including successful proposals, except for contractor's payrolls (see (b)(4)(iv)).	Same as contract file.
(iv) Contractor's payrolls submitted in accordance with Department of Labor regulations, with related certifications, anti-kickback affidavits, and other related papers.	3 years after contract completion unless contract performance is the subject of an enforcement action on that date.
(5) Solicited and unsolicited unsuccessful offers, quotations, bids, and proposals:	.
(i) Relating to contracts above the simplified acquisition threshold.	If filed separately from contract file, until contract is completed. Otherwise, the same as related contract file.
(ii) Relating to contracts at or below the simplified acquisition threshold.	1 year after date of award or until final payment, whichever is later.
(6) Records for canceled solicitations.	5 years after cancellation.
(7) Other copies of procurement file records used by component elements of a contracting office for administrative purposes.	Upon termination or completion.
(8) Documents pertaining generally to the contractor as described at 4.801(c)(3).	Until superseded or obsolete.
(9) Data submitted to the Federal Procurement Data System (FPDS). Electronic data file maintained by fiscal year, containing unclassified records of all procurements other than simplified acquisitions, and information required under 4.603.	5 years after submittal to FPDS.
(10) Investigations, cases pending or in litigation (including protests), or similar matters.	Until final clearance or settlement, or, if related to a document identified in (b)(1) - (9), for the retention period specified for the related document, whichever is later.

Source: Federal Acquisition Regulation, effective June 16, 2010.

Appendix C—Records Management Guidance

The Federal Records Act, as amended

The Federal Records Act, as amended and codified at 44 U.S.C. Chapter 31, requires the head of each Federal agency to make and preserve records, maintain a continuing program for the economic and efficient management of the records, and provide for transfer of records to a records center if such transfer may affect the substantial economies and increased operating efficiency. The records management program overseen by Federal agency heads must provide for effective controls over the creation, maintenance, and use of records in the conduct of business, and for cooperation with the Administrator of the General Services Administration and the Archivist in applying standards, procedures, and techniques to improve records management.

National Archives and Records Administration Code of Federal Regulations, 36 CFR 1220, Federal Records

The National Archives and Records Administration Code of Federal Regulations Title 36, Chapter XII, Subchapter B prescribes policies for Federal agencies' records management programs to comply with the Federal Records Act, as amended. The regulations in this subchapter require adequate controls over the creation, maintenance, and use of records; provisions to ensure that records no longer of current use to an agency are promptly disposed of or retired; and an assigned responsibility for the development of the records management program.

Federal Acquisition Regulation (FAR), Subpart 4.8 - Government Contract Files

The Federal Acquisition Regulation, Subpart 4.8, Government Contract Records, prescribes requirements for establishing, maintaining, and disposing of contract files. It requires the head of each office performing contracting, contract administration, or paying functions to establish records containing the records of all contractual actions.

Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, Section 204.805 – Disposal of Contract Files

The Defense Federal Acquisition Regulation Supplement, Section 204.805, Disposal of Contract Files Subsection 3, requires the holding of contract records in the office responsible for maintaining them for a period of 12 months after completion. After the initial 12 months, the records must be sent to the local records holding or staging area until they are eligible for destruction. If no space is available locally, the files must be transferred to the General Services Administration Federal Records Center.

Department of State, 5 Foreign Affairs Manual 400, Records Management, and 5 Foreign Affairs Handbook - 4 H-100 through 5 FAH-4 H-400, Records Management

Volume 5 of the Department of State's Foreign Affairs Manual and Foreign Affairs Handbook establishes the policies and procedures for the Department of State Records Management Program and all of its components in the United States and abroad, as required by federal statutes and regulations.

United States Agency for International Development Administrative Directive Systems, Chapter 502, the USAID Records Management Program

The USAID Records Management Program, found in USAID Administrative Directive Systems (ADS), Chapter 502, contains the policies and procedures for creating, maintaining, preserving, and disposing of USAID records. ADS Chapter 502 was revised on September 2, 2008.

Department of Defense Directive 5015.2, DoD Records Management Program

DoDD 5015.2, dated March 6, 2000, updates DoD policy and responsibility for the DoD Records Management Program and updates policy and responsibilities for life-cycle management (creation, maintenance and use, and disposition) of information as records in all media, including electronic.

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction5760.01A, Records Management Policy for the Joint Staff and Combatant Commands, and Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual (CJCSM) 5760.01, Joint Staff and Combatant Command Records Management Manual: Volumes I and II

Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Instruction 5760.01A, dated April 30, 2007, provides policy and guidance to the Joint Staff and the combatant commanders in the conduct of the Joint Staff and Combatant Command Records Management Program. Volume I of the Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual 5760.01, dated February 7, 2008, sets forth records management administrative instructions and procedural guidance for the Joint Staff and combatant commands. Volume II of the same manual, dated March 10, 2003, comprises the Joint Staff and combatant command records disposition schedule.

CENTCOM Regulation 25-50, Records Management Policy

CENTCOM R 25-50, dated October 12, 2009, prescribes policies and procedures for management of the Command Records Management Program, directed by Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff Manual 5760.01A.

Army Regulation 25-1, Information Management, Army Knowledge Management and Information Technology

Army Regulation 25-1, *Information Management, Army Knowledge Management and Information Technology*, dated December 4, 2008, and effective January 5, 2009, updates and adds to Army records management responsibilities and assigns the records management senior Army role to the Administrative Assistant to the Secretary of the Army in accordance with public laws and regulatory guidance.

Army Regulation 25-400-2, Information Management, the Army Records Information Management System

Army Regulation 25-400-2, *Information Management, the Army Records Information Management System*, dated October 2, 2007, implements Army Regulation 25-1, Chapter 8, *Records Management Policy*, governs the maintenance and disposition of Army information, and implements new policy on recordkeeping requirements for certain Army regulations.

Department of the Army Pamphlet 430-2, Guide to Record Keeping in the Army

This pamphlet, dated August 11, 2008, provides operational procedures and guidelines for recordkeeping in the Army. It is to be used with Army Regulation 25-400-2. It provides guidelines for records cutoffs and transfers to a records holding area.

Air Force Policy Directive 33-3, Communications and Information, Information Management

Air Force Policy Directive 33-3, *Communications and Information*, *Information Management*, dated March 28, 2006, establishes the framework for how the Air Force creates, uses, and preserves information and data to achieve its strategic priorities, fulfill its missions, support its programs, deliver its capabilities, and meet its accountability obligations prescribed by statute.

Air Force Instruction 33-322, Communications and Information, Records Management Program

Air Force Instruction 33-322, *Communications and Information, Records Management Program*, dated October 7, 2003, implements Air Force Policy Directive 33-3, *Information Management*. It establishes policy and assigns responsibilities for life-cycle management (i.e., creation, maintenance and use, and disposition) of information as records in all media through the Air Force Records Management Program.

Air Force Manual 33-363, Communications and Information, Management of Records

Air Force Manual 33-363, dated March 1, 2008, implements Department of Defense Directive 5015.2, *DoD Records Management Program*, and Air Force Policy Directive 33-3, *Information Management*. It establishes the requirement to use the Air Force Records Information Management System; establishes guidelines for managing all records (regardless of media); and defines methods and the format for record storage, file procedures, converting paper records to other media or vice versa; and defines the minimum to comply with records management legal and policy requirements.

Air Force Instruction 33-364, Communications and Information, Records Disposition – Procedures and Responsibilities

Air Force Instruction 33-364, *Communications and Information, Records Disposition – Procedures and Responsibilities*, dated December 22, 2006, implements Air Force Policy Directive 33-3, *Information Management*, by listing program objectives and responsibilities, guiding personnel in disposing of special types of records, retiring or transferring records using staging areas, and retrieving information from inactive records.

Appendix D—Records Management Deficiencies Identified in Previous SIGIR Reports

Audit Reports

6/25/2004, 04-001 - Coalition Provisional Authority Coordination of Donated Funds
Important information about planned reconstruction projects and donations was not being captured.

7/30/2004, 04-008 - Coalition Provisional Authority Control Over Seized and Vested Assets
Disbursement and approval documentation for the seized and vested assets was not readily available.

4/30/2005, 05-007 - Administration of Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund Contract Files
Contract files were incomplete and did not contain signed copies of the award or the required justification and approval records.

4/30/2005, 05-008 - Administration of Contracts Funded by the Development Fund of Iraq
Files were missing contract awards, evidence that goods and services were received, invoices, and evidence of payment.

7/8/2005, 05-009 - Reconciliation of Reporting Differences of the Source of Funds Used on Contracts after June 28, 2004
Development Fund for Iraq contract awards files were missing.

07/26/2005, 05-010 - Interim Briefing to the Project and Contracting Office - Iraq and the Joint Contracting Command–Iraq on the Audit of the Award-Fee Process
Contract files were missing appointment letters for the award fee evaluation personnel.

10/26/2005, 05-016 - Management of the Contracts and Grants Used To Construct and Operate the Babylon Police Academy
Contract and grant files did not contain the required documentation or the proper approval authority.

10/26/2005, 05-020 - Management of the Contracts, Grant, and Micro-Purchases Used To Rehabilitate the Karbala Library
Contract and grant files did not contain accurate or required records on site visits, performance reports, and post award assessments.

1/23/2006, 05-025 - Management of the Commander's Emergency Response Program for Fiscal Year 2005
Commander's Emergency Response Program project files were missing required documentation including appointment letters for purchasing officers, contract awards, and invoices from vendors.

4/28/2006, 06-008 - Development Fund for Iraq–Cash Accountability Review: Joint Area Support Group–Central
There was no file system to store and readily retrieve the pay agent's documents.

4/28/2006 06-009 - Review of Task Force Shield Programs
There were limited records documenting program cost, how the money was used, or the location of the millions of dollars of equipment purchased with Task Force Shield funds.

4/28/2006, 06-010 - Review of the Multi-National Security Transition Command–Iraq Reconciliation of the Iraqi Armed Forces Seized Assets Fund
Numerous contracts, modifications, invoices, receipts, and receiving reports needed to support or justify making payments were missing from the files.

4/29/2006, 06-011 -Management of the Primary Healthcare Centers Construction Projects
Contract file does not have a record of who directed an estimated $39 million in undefinitized constructive changes to the award.

4/28/2006, 06-015 - Iraq Armed Forces Seized Assets Fund: Review of Contracts and Financial Documents
Contract files were incomplete and missing contract awards, amendments/modifications, deobligation confirmations, and closure checklists/forms.

1/30/2007, 06-029 - Review of DynCorp International, LLC Contract Number S LMAQM-04-C-0030, Task Order 0338, for the Iraqi Police Training Program Support
The contract file was missing key records on monitoring of the contractors' performance and acceptance of the contractors' work.

4/26/2007, 07-006 - Management of the Commander's Emergency Response Program in Iraq for Fiscal Year 2006
CERP project files were missing, and the existing project files did not contain the required information to include appointment letters for purchasing and pay agents, copies of contract award, and invoices from vendors.

10/29/2007, 08-003 - Review of the Use of Contracts in Managing Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Projects
Contract files contained limited documentation on the award fee results, contractors' performance, and disclosure restriction statements.

1/25/2008, 08-006 - Commander's Emergency Response Program in Iraq Funds Many Large-Scale Projects
Management weaknesses related to incomplete project files continue to persist.

4/29/2008, 08-011 - Review of Outcome, Cost, and Oversight of Electricity-Sector Reconstruction Contract with Perini Corporation
Quality-assurance reports were initially unavailable and dispersed throughout multiple locations in Iraq and the United States.

1/14/2009, 09-010 - Oversight of Aegis' Performance on Security Services Contracts in Iraq with the Department of Defense
There was no central depository for the contract-related electronic records that provide a history on the contractor's performance.

1/29/2009, 09-011 - Opportunities To Improve Management of the Quick Response Fund
The project files did not contain the all required closeout documentation identifying results of the project.

4/26/2009, 09-016 - Asset-transfer Process for Iraq Reconstruction Projects Lacked Unity and Accountability
There is no accurate and comprehensive project management information system on project construction, transfer, and operational status.

7/26/2009, 09-026 - Commander's Emergency Response Program: Hotel Construction Completed, but Project Management Issues Remain
Quality-assurance documentation was largely missing from the contract files.

7/28/2009, 09-023 - Investigation and Remediation Records Concerning Incidents of Weapons Discharges by Private Security Contractors Can Be Improved
Files lacked records concerning reviews, investigations undertaken, and remedial actions for many of the weapons discharge incidents.

10/26/2009, 10-002 - Data Provided to the Government of Iraq on U.S. Reconstruction Projects Lacked Clarity
The Iraq Reconstruction Management System project data provided to the Government of Iraq was unclear and gave the appearance of duplicate projects and payments.

10/27/2009, 10-003 - Iraq Commander's Emergency Response Program Generally Managed Well, but Project Documentation and Oversight Can Be Improved
I-CERP project files were missing critical internal control documentation, such as receipts for cash payments and electronic funds transfers.

1/28/2010, 10-007 - Wamar International Successfully Completed Contracts, but Unanticipated Problems Affected Costs and Schedule
The official 2006 and 2007 Wamar contract award files were missing.

4/26/2010, 10-013 Commander's Emergency Response Program: Projects at Baghdad Airport Provided Some Benefits, but Waste and Management Problems Occurred
The CERP files lacked key records related to the transfer of projects to the Government of Iraq.

4/29/2010, 10-015 - Health Center Sustainment Contract Resulted in Some Repairs, but Iraqi Maintenance Capability Was Not Achieved
The acquisition justification and other award-related records were not readily available at the time of the audit.

4/26/10, 10-013 - Commander's Emergency Response Program: Projects at Baghdad Airport Provided Some Benefits, but Waste and Management Problems Occurred
Project files were not well-maintained, and project tracking data were incomplete.

Inspection Reports

1/14/2010, PA-09-168 - Renovation of the Tomb of the Unknown Soldier, Baghdad Iraq
Project file was not readily available and lacked payment documentation and quality assurance reports.

4/21/2010, PA-09-189 - Basrah Modern Slaughterhouse, Basrah, Iraq
Project file lacked legal analysis or written justification for the decision to approve the contractor's submittals.

Appendix E—Acronyms

Acronym	Description
AFCEE	Air Force Center for Engineering and the Environment
ARCENT	U.S. Army Central Command
CERP	Commanders Emergency Response Program
CENTCOM	U.S. Central Command
DoD	Department of Defense
DoS	Department of State
ESF	Economic Support Fund
FAR	Federal Acquisition Regulation
IRRF	Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Fund
ISFF	Iraq Security Forces Fund
ITAO	Iraq Transition Assistance Office
ISPO	Iraq Strategic Partnership Office
JCC-I/A	Joint Contracting Command-Iraq/Afghanistan
SIGIR	Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction
USACE	United States Army Corps of Engineers
USAID	United States Agency for International Development
USF-I	United States Forces-Iraq

Appendix F—Audit Team Members

This report was prepared and the audit conducted under the direction of David R. Warren, Assistant Inspector General for Audits, Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction.

The staff members who conducted the audit and contributed to the report include:

Nancee Needham

W. Dan Haigler

Robin McCoy

Arthur Granger

Walter Franzen

Appendix G—Management Comments

SIGIR recommendations (see page 15 of the draft report):

2. SIGIR recommends that the Commander, U.S. Central Command, in implementing the JS recommendations, include in the new guidance specific direction related to the transfer and preservation of reconstruction records that incorporates methods for tracking records, identification of program and associated funding, and final storage location.

RESPONSE: Concur. For the last several months USCENTCOM J6-R has been working with JTFs and service components to further delineate CENTCOM Regulation (CCR) 25-50, Records Management Policy, with regard to USCENTCOM and component records. CCJ6-R has been developing a Fragmentary Order (FRAGO) to provide records management program implementation guidance with respect to lines of demarcation between USCENTCOM and Service Component Command records. We will now add a focus specifically related to the proper lifecycle management of reconstruction records.

3. SIGIR recommends that the Commander, U.S. Central Command direct the CENTCOM Contracting Command to review the efforts by the former JCC-I/A to identify remaining issues that need to be addressed in the preservation planning process, such as completeness of contracting records, missing records, tracking records, and the adequacy of storage facilities.

RESPONSE: Concur. USCENTCOM J6-R is communicating with CENTCOM Contracting Command to assess the state of their records program and provide guidance and assistance, on-site if possible, to ensure the proper lifecycle management of reconstruction records. CCJ6-R will incorporate specific guidance in the next revision to CCR 25-50, Records Management Policy, to specifically address this.

===

GENERAL COMMENTS ON THE REPORT

Page 7, first bullet under the fourth paragraph states, **"The volume, location, size, and format of USF-I records was unknown."** CCJ6-R was minimally aware SIGIR was performing this study, but only through a short, 10-minute telecon which addressed only contractor records. In any event, without other specific knowledge of this SIGIR review and this draft bullet, CCJ6-R sent a team to USF-I in May to ascertain these very aspects – mission accomplished. Additionally, CCJ6-R has been working with USF-I to download approximately 38 terabytes (TB) of data to a portable Storage Area Network (SAN) device in September 2010 and ship back to HQ USCENTCOM for uploading, organizing, and archiving.

Page 7, third bullet states, **"Directorates and staff offices lack standard operating procedures for basic records management requirements, including retention and migration."** Around the same time CCJ6-R received this draft SIGIR report, USF-I had previously been working on and published a Records Management Policy Fragmentary Order (FRAGO), dated 18 July 2010. USCENTCOM's FRAGO for USF-I Records Management will support and further delineate policy and procedure.

Page 8, first paragraph, first sentence states, **"The JS team found that CENTCOM had not provided and enforced adequate records management guidance to the USF-I and its predecessor, the Multi-National Force-Iraq."** Do not concur. This sentence should read, **"USCENTCOM provided records management guidance to its AOR beginning in February 2008, which includes USF-I and its predecessor, Multi-National Forces-Iraq, as well as the Service Component Commands."** CENTCOM Regulation (CCR) 25-108, Records Management Policy, existed with the first regulation 20 February 2008, followed by a revised USCENTCOM Regulation 25-50, Records Management Policy, dated 12 October 2009. In addition to policy guidance provided by the referenced CCRs, CCJ6-R has conducted RIP/TOA Conferences with inbound JTF Staffs prior to deployment for several years. Specific briefs and conference materials are provided on Records Management at these conferences to include the names, addresses, DSN phone numbers and e-mail address of USCENTCOM Records Management points of contact. In the case of III Corps' assumption of USF-I staff responsibilities, the RIP/TOA Conference was held at Fort Hood Texas from 19-23 October 2009.

Page 8, first paragraph, second sentence states, **"Moreover, CENTCOM established a policy in October 2009, whereby records management was delegated to the individual military services rather than to CENTCOM and its USF-I components in Iraq."** This sentence is incorrect; it should be changed to read, **"Moreover, CENTCOM's Records Management policy, established in February 2008 and revised in October 2009, directed that subordinate Service Component Commands (USARCENT, USMARCENT, USAFCENT, and USNAVCENT) use their Service regulations to accomplish Service Component records management."** USCENTCOM Regulation (CCR) 25-108, Records Management Policy, dated 20 February 2008, para 2.b., established the requirement for component commands to perform records management consistent with Joint Staff Procedures, but allows them to use their more-familiar service regulations to do so. Appendix A, para 3 of the same regulation maintains USCENTCOM's non-delegated program management responsibility for records, outlining the requirement for Component Commands to provide points of contact to and maintain coordination with USCENTCOM's Command Records Manager. Further, Appendix E, para 3a-e further outlines requirements for records of crisis and contingency operations. CCR 25-50, Records Management Policy, dated 12 October 2009, (superseding CCR 25-108), Chapter 1, para 1-2., b., Chapter 2, para 2-4, and Chapter 4, para 4-4 reaffirms this same guidance. Records management was not delegated; direction for handling of records for Service Component Commands was given.

Page 10, last paragraph, fifth sentence reads, **"However, the branch official noted it had not received any guidance from CENTCOM or the U.S. Army Central Command (ARCENT) regarding where and to what office the records should be shipped."** Although the branch official may have stated this, USCENTCOM Regulation 25-50 (original and revised) provides the guidance for disposition and lists CCJ6-RDR as the proponent for the regulation. Whether under USARCENT or USCENTCOM, the standing policy was in effect either way. JCC-I/A had previously been accomplishing Records Management duties IAW their own guidelines, including shipping. When the Command inactivated and became CENTCOM Contracting Command, USCENTCOM's Records Management Regulation was still available for use as a guiding directive.

APPROVED BY: PREPARED BY:
Robert H. Bennett   Charles H. Rothell
Chief, Resources and Analysis Division   Records Analyst
USCENTCOM CCJ6-R   USCENTCOM CCJ6-RDR

2

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
THIRD ARMY
UNITED STATES ARMY CENTRAL
1881 HARDEE AVE SW
FORT MCPHERSON, GA 30330-1064

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF:

ACEN-RMZ   28 Jul 10

MEMORANDUM FOR Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, 400 Army Navy Drive, Arlington, Virginia 22202

SUBJECT: SIGIR Draft Report 10-021 – Plans to Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need to be Improved

1. This memorandum addresses the recommendation made to the Commander, Third Army/USARCENT in the subject report.

2. Third Army/USARCENT concurs with the report recommendation to review the processes being used to store and locate CERP records.

3. Third Army/USARCENT has a dedicated effort under way towards establishing a comprehensive Records Management program throughout the command. This effort will establish policy and procedures for records and operational data sources maintenance, preservation, and retirement appropriately. Our procedures will also ensure a smooth yet accountable means for the transfer of all staff directorate's files to Shaw Air Force Base, SC, when Third Army/USARCENT executes its BRAC move in 2011.

4. To preserve all categories of contingency operations records, the Third Army/USARCENT Director, Resource Management has drafted Standard Operating Procedures (SOP) for Record Storage and Document Retrieval which has been sent to all our forward units for review and comment. We expect this SOP to be published NLT 1 September 2010. When published, we will issue orders to the Financial Management (FM) offices in theater to begin executing the new procedures. We will post the SOP to the Army Knowledge Online (AKO) web portal to permit easy access by all forward FM offices. Also, the Command is hiring four full time DA Civilians to manage the millions of files/records received from our FM offices throughout Kuwait, Iraq, Afghanistan and Qatar.

5. We appreciate the efforts of SIGIR to help improve document storage. Third Army/USARCENT will do its part to ensure operational files and data are properly maintained.

6. For further information contact Mr. Edward F. Chandler, 404-464-4885.

STEPHEN M. TWITTY
Brigadier General, US Army
Chief of Staff

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY
GULF REGION DISTRICT
ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS
APO AE 09342

REPLY TO
ATTENTION OF

CETAG   21 July 2010

MEMORANDUM FOR Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction, US Embassy Annex II, Room 1013, APO AE 09316

SUBJECT: Draft SIGIR Audit Report – Plans to Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need to Be Improved (SIGIR 10-021)

1. This memorandum provides the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Gulf Region District response to the subject draft audit report.

2. The Gulf Region District reviewed the subject draft report and generally agrees with the facts as presented in the report. Gulf Region District provided additional comments for clarity and accuracy in the enclosure.

3. Thank you for the opportunity to review the draft report and provide written comments for incorporation in the final report.

4. If you have any questions, please contact Mr. Robert Jones at (540) 678-2996 or via email Robert.A.Jones@usace.army.mil.

Encl
as

JON L. CHRISTENSEN
COL, EN
Commanding

July 28, 2010

Mr. Stuart Bowen
Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction
400 Army Navy Drive
Arlington, VA 22202

Dear Mr. Bowen:

Thank you for the opportunity to respond to SIGIR's audit report 10-021, "Plans to Preserve Iraq Reconstruction Program and Contract Records Need to be Improved". USAID appreciates the importance of maintaining contract and program records and ensuring that those records are not lost, especially in Iraq. The audit report included two recommendations for USAID.

Recommendation No 1: SIGIR recommends that the U.S. Secretaries of Defense and State and the Administrator of USAID assign an office the responsibility for ensuring the preservation of the Iraq reconstruction records to provide transparency and accountability at the Department level. At a minimum, these offices should coordinate the development of a master list of records to (1) ensure record completeness, (2) link to program, associated contracts, and funding, and (3) develop uniform retention policies that are consistent with the needs of investigative and audit organizations. The office should also consult with agency historians to determine which records may require permanent archiving.

USAID is taking this recommendation under advisement.

Recommendation No 7: SIGIR recommends that the Administrator, USAID, provide guidance to its Iraq Mission on the preservation of reconstruction records and the Mission Director, USAID/Iraq develop plans for the preservation of reconstruction records in accordance with this guidance.

USAID/Iraq has implemented an Agency-wide Vital Records Program (VRP) prescribed under ADS 511. The vital records under the VRP are those records that are essential to the continuity of USAID critical activities under national emergency conditions. The Vital Records process involves scanning all contract files and many other records. The resulting data is stored offline and off-site. The Vital Records process was specifically designed to access and recover records in case of emergency and currently, the Mission is in full compliance with the VRP policy.

As referenced in the audit report, and in accordance with the current practice, all paper files are cataloged and stored in the USAID/Iraq document storage room. However, based on the audit recommendation, and in compliance with ADS 502.5.7g, files covering no more than one fiscal year, in addition to current fiscal year will be packed in official retirement boxes and shipped to the USAID Records Depository located in the Ronald Regan Building in Washington, D.C. for retention. The Records Depository serves as a staging area for files awaiting transfer to the Washington National Records Center in Suitland, Maryland.

Thank you again for the opportunity to respond to the recommendations in this report.

Sincerely,

George Laudato
Special Assistant to the Administrator
For the Middle East

Appendix H—SIGIR Mission and Contact Information

SIGIR's Mission	Regarding the U.S. reconstruction plans, programs, and operations in Iraq, the Special Inspector General for Iraq Reconstruction provides independent and objective: • oversight and review through comprehensive audits, inspections, and investigations • advice and recommendations on policies to promote economy, efficiency, and effectiveness • deterrence of malfeasance through the prevention and detection of fraud, waste, and abuse • information and analysis to the Secretary of State, the Secretary of Defense, the Congress, and the American people through Quarterly Reports
Obtaining Copies of SIGIR Reports and Testimonies	To obtain copies of SIGIR documents at no cost, go to SIGIR's Web site (www.sigir.mil).
To Report Fraud, Waste, and Abuse in Iraq Relief and Reconstruction Programs	Help prevent fraud, waste, and abuse by reporting suspicious or illegal activities to the SIGIR Hotline: • Web: www.sigir.mil/submit_fraud.html • Phone: 703-602-4063 • Toll Free: 866-301-2003

Congressional Affairs	Hillel Weinberg
	Assistant Inspector General for Congressional Affairs
	Mail: Office of the Special Inspector General
	         for Iraq Reconstruction
	         400 Army Navy Drive
	         Arlington, VA 22202-4704
	Phone 703-428-1059
	Email hillel.weinberg@sigir.mil

Public Affairs	Deborah Horan
	Director of Public Affairs
	Mail: Office of the Special Inspector General for Iraq
	          Reconstruction
	          400 Army Navy Drive
	          Arlington, VA 22202-4704
	Phone: 703-428-1217
	Fax: 703-428-0817
	Email: PublicAffairs@sigir.mil